DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 234 CE 083 770

AUTHOR	Haberkern, Rachel M.
TITLE	Implementing Charitable Choice at the State and Local Levels.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Information Network, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Palo Alto, CA.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Administration for Children and Families (DHHS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2002-07-00
NOTE	14p.; For number 4 of volume 6, see ED 467 003.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.welfareinfo.org/implementingcharitablechoiceIN.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT	Issue Notes; v6 n5 Jul 2002
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Adult Programs; Case Studies; Church Programs; *Community Programs; Cooperative Programs; Definitions; Delivery Systems; Employment Services; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; Guidelines; Health Services; Mental Health; *Nonprofit Organizations; Postsecondary Education; Public Policy; *Religious Organizations; Social Science Research; Social Services; *State Church Separation; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; Substance Abuse; Trend Analysis; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	*Faith Based Programs; Michigan; New York; Ohio; Personal Responsibility and Work Opp Recon Act; Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

ABSTRACT

The 1998 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) was the first federal legislation to contain a "charitable choice" provision allowing faith-based organizations (FBOs) to compete for state and federal government funds on the same basis as secular providers. For FBOs that consider pursuit of government funding a suitable strategy, financial collaboration with state and local governments can offer increased financial resources, capacity, and networking opportunities. State and local governments can use the federal faith-based initiative to increase FBO participation in by taking the following actions: ensure that all stakeholders understand PRWORA's charitable choice provision; model the federal government's "faith-friendly" actions at the state and local levels; and remove barriers to FBO participation in government procurement processes. Other issues that must be addressed are as follows: revising government grant and contracting processes; overcoming barriers to collaboration that exist in state/local laws and practices; ensuring the existence of secular alternatives to FBO-provided services; and holding FBOs accountable for restricting the use of government funds to approved services and protecting clients' religious freedoms. Research has identified numerous innovative strategies and practices for fostering partnerships between FBOs and state and local governments in Ohio, New York, and Michigan. (Contains 35 references.) (MN)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 234

Welfare Information Network
Issue Notes
Vol. 6, No. 5
July 2002

Implementing Charitable Choice at the State and Local Levels

Rachel M. Haberkern

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Van Lare

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE083770

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK

Issue Notes

Vol. 6, No. 5 July 2002

Implementing Charitable Choice at the State and Local Levels

By Rachel M. Haberkern

Background

Faith-based organizations (FBOs)—religious congregations as well as "pervasively sectarian" or religiously affiliated nonprofit organizations—have a long history of receiving government funds to provide social services to low-income individuals. However, when the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) was enacted in 1996, Section 104 contained "charitable choice" provisions that, for the first time, allowed FBOs to compete for state and federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds on the same basis as secular providers. The scope of financial collaboration between FBOs and government was expanded to give FBOs equal opportunity to obtain government funding while maintaining their religious character and protecting the religious freedoms of their clients. The charitable choice provisions of the welfare reform legislation also applied to the Welfare-to-Work (WtW) grants program, the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), and some Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) programs.

After the 1996 reforms, the number of government grants and contracts issued to FBOs for the provision of social services increased, though not to a great extent and not at equal rates across the nation. However, with the inauguration of President George W. Bush in early 2001, the landscape began to change more rapidly. The Bush administration's domestic policy agenda strongly embraces and promotes charitable choice as a positive and effective means to deliver social services. One of the President's first acts was to establish Offices and Centers of Faith Based and Community Initiatives in the White House and five executive branch departments. The White House later conducted an audit of these five cabinet-level departments to identify any existing barriers to collaboration with FBOs. The Administration's interest in charitable choice has also encouraged support for faith-based initiatives in Congress. The House passed the Community Solutions Act (H.R. 7) in late 2001, and the Senate is now considering the Charity, Aid, Recovery and Empowerment Act (S. 1924).

Although federal support for charitable choice has been substantial, confusion still exists over financial collaboration between FBOs and government. In some states and localities, FBOs and government officials have been actively pursuing collaboration; in others, questions continue to arise about how the charitable choice provisions can and should be implemented. This *Issue Note* addresses the objectives, methods, and challenges of state and local implementation of charitable choice. It follows up on an earlier Welfare Information Network (WIN) *Issue Note*, "Charitable Choice and Welfare Reform: Collaboration between State and Local Governments and Faith-Based Organizations," at http://www.welfareinfo.org/issuenotecharitablechoice.htm. For still more information on this topic, see the WIN publication "Frequently Asked Questions from State and Local Agencies About Involving the Faith Community in Welfare Reform," at

http://www.welfareinfo.org/frequent.htm; or visit the WIN web page on *Faith-Based Initiatives* at http://www.welfareinfo.org/faithbase.asp.

Policy Issues

What are the objectives of increasing the role of FBOs under charitable choice?

Many supporters of charitable choice believe FBOs can succeed as well, if not better, than secular organizations in providing services to welfare recipients. These stakeholders believe FBOs' strong presence and trust within their communities give them an advantage in working with welfare recipients. Some FBOs, including religious congregations, have already developed personal relationships with welfare recipients and low-income individuals in the community. FBOs also often have resources on hand, including facilities and well-mobilized volunteers, which can be used to provide services. Finally, FBOs may be one of the few sources of support for legal immigrants, families that have been sanctioned under welfare reform, and other groups that have been excluded from the social safety net.

For FBOs that regard the pursuit of government funding as a suitable strategy, financial collaboration with state and local governments can offer many benefits:

Increased financial resources. Government funding can be attractive to FBOs that want to start a new initiative, expand existing programs, or increase the number of people they are serving. Government funding can also afford FBOs credibility among potential private-sector funders, which could lead to increased financial support from foundations and corporations.

Increased capacity. Government grants or contracts often bring with them technical assistance, which can help FBOs improve their capacity to provide high-quality services. This technical assistance often relates to the development of outcome measures and program evaluation strategies, areas in which many contractors lack expertise. In some cases, simply winning a government grant or contract is enough to stimulate or strengthen an organization's internal procedures and evaluation due to the extensive and detailed requirements of this type of collaboration.

Increased networking opportunities. Government funding can also mean invitations to forums and meetings as well as exposure to other opportunities to develop relationships with foundations, government officials, secular nonprofit organizations, and members of the business community. Some FBOs view the prospect of government funds as a valuable opportunity to "get a seat at the table" to discuss and help develop policy related to low-income and welfare issues.

For more information on the benefits of, and guidelines for, FBO participation in charitable choice, call Amy Sherman of the Hudson Institute's Faith in Communities Program at 434/293-5656. Also see Amy L. Sherman, *The Charitable Choice Handbook for Ministry* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Public Justice, 2001), at http://www.hudsonfaithincommunites.org.

How can the federal faith-based initiative be used to increase FBO participation at the state and local levels?

Federal support for social services provided by FBOs can influence financial collaboration at the state and local levels in many ways. First, through education and information dissemination, the federal government can ensure that all stakeholders understand the charitable choice provisions of PRWORA and can access information on how to become involved with collaboration between FBOs and government. The Centers for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives within the U.S. Departments of Labor, Justice, Education, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban

Development have already initiated this process through their specialized web pages on faith-based initiatives or charitable choice. These web pages provide contact information for state and local officials as well as helpful online resources and grant announcements targeted to FBOs and community-based organizations (CBOs). The Centers have also done a significant amount of outreach to FBOs and state and local officials.

Second, state and local governments can model the "faith-friendly" actions of the federal government by appointing a liaison to the faith community and by creating an office to promote and support faith-based initiatives. States and localities have also held educational meetings for stakeholders, established demonstration projects, and changed state procurement requirements and practices to remove barriers to contracting with FBOs (U.S. General Accounting Office, January 2002). A well-known example of this kind of state action is FaithWorks, a program Governor Frank O'Bannon established in 1999 within the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration. FaithWorks helps faith-based organizations apply for state and federal funds to support new or existing self-sufficiency programs. For more information, call the toll-free hotline at 800/599-6043; or visit http://www.state.in.us/faithworks.

Third, the federal initiative can support FBOs in developing partnerships with state and local governments through capacity development. Some FBOs interested in partnering with government may lack the capacity to apply for and maintain a government grant or contract. They may lack staff, start-up funds, proposal-writing experience, or expertise in accounting and bookkeeping. One strategy to increase the capacity of smaller organizations or congregations is the $30 million Capital Compassion Fund recently announced by the Department of Health and Human Services. The Fund will match private giving with federal funds to support intermediary organizations that help smaller FBOs manage and administer government grants and contracts as well as provide technical assistance to FBOs and CBOs. In addition, the U.S. Department of Labor recently awarded grants to 12 states and 29 FBOs and CBOs. The grants aim to link FBOs and grassroots community organizations to states' One-Stop Career Systems. For more information, call Elissa Pruett of the U.S. Department of Labor at 202/693-4676.

Finally, the federal government can encourage collaboration at the state and local levels by helping states and localities identify and remove the barriers to FBO participation in government procurement processes. Although charitable choice is law, many states and localities have not yet fully implemented the provisions that give FBOs equal access to government funding without compromising their religious identity.

How can state and local governments' grant and contracting processes be improved to effectively include FBOs?

The charitable choice provisions of the 1996 welfare reform law maintain that states and localities must allow religious organizations to compete for and receive federal funding for the provision of social services on the same basis as other service providers. Charitable choice is a mandatory procurement rule. Furthermore, religious organizations may not be forced to change their internal governance procedures or to remove religious art, icons, or symbols to receive these funds.

The grant and contracting processes often determine whether and how governments are complying with the charitable choice provisions. Contracts or requests for proposals (RFPs) written before 1996 sometimes contained language that excluded FBOs from consideration because of their religious nature, the structure of their organization, or their hiring practices. Or, more likely, ambiguous language may have left state and local officials unsure about which organizations and which services being provided could be considered for government funding.

Many states have taken steps to comply with the charitable choice provisions by making the necessary changes to ensure FBO inclusion in grant and contracting processes. Some states, however, have not yet acted. The Center for Public Justice (2000) gave 37 states and the District of Columbia a failing grade in 2000 for shortcomings in applying the charitable choice provisions, including the failure to make the necessary changes in procurement procedures and contractual language. Monsma and Mounts (2002) of the Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society found that 21 percent of all faith-based programs applying for government funding were turned down, compared with seven percent of secular nonprofit organizations, which could suggest that some aspects of the procurement process were biased against FBOs.

Many states and localities have taken clear steps to implement PRWORA's charitable choice provisions in their grant and contracting processes. For example, Texas added new language to client service contracts, effective June 1, 1998, that emphasizes the religious liberty protections for FBOs that choose to contract with the state human services department while maintaining the limits on government funding of worship or proselytization. (View this contract language at http://www.dhs.state.tx.us/communitypartnerships/charitable/language.html.) In late 1999, California passed legislation requiring the state's Department of Social Services to develop regulations on the integration of the federal charitable choice provisions. The department sent a memorandum to all county social services offices to inform them of this development and included a survey to determine whether the counties had any current contracts with community- or faith-based service providers. (View this document at http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/getinfo/acin99/i-88_99.pdf.) It should be noted, however, that the regulations are still being developed almost three years later.

To comply with the charitable choice provisions, states and localities should first review their RFPs, contracts, and other procurement materials for language that may suggest FBOs are discouraged or prohibited from receiving government funds. Any ambiguous wording should be revised or removed. If recent changes have been made to the procurement process, state and local governments should ensure that all personnel and subcontractors are aware of these changes. Government could also develop explicit regulations to increase understanding of how the charitable choice provisions should be implemented. If the state or locality is interested in further promoting government support of FBO-provided services, it could pursue strategies to encourage collaboration, including those discussed earlier. For further guidance, and a compliance checklist, see Stanley Carlson-Thies, *Charitable Choice for Welfare and Community Services: An Implementation Guide for State, Local, and Federal Officials* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Public Justice, December 2000), at http://downloads.weblogger.com/gems/cpj/CCImplementationGuide.pdf.

How can FBOs and states and localities work together to address the barriers to collaboration in state and local laws or practices?

Many state and local government officials may not be fully aware of PRWORA's charitable choice provisions and of how these provisions affect financial collaboration with FBOs. This lack of awareness can lead to laws or practices that unintentionally discriminate against FBOs, such as:

- neglecting to include the faith community when announcing RFPs;
- offering large-scale grants or contracts for a large volume of services or services for a large area (e.g., an entire county), which may be more than a smaller FBO or CBO can handle;
- requiring audited financial statements from all potential grantees, which may exclude many FBOs;
- omitting the faith-based community from offers of technical assistance; and

- maintaining state or county laws prohibiting contracting with, or funding of, organizations that discriminate in their hiring on the basis of religion without including an exemption for FBOs. (Under Section 104 of PRWORA, FBOs maintain their preexisting right to consider religion in their hiring and firing decisions.)

The state is responsible for ensuring that state law or practice does not directly conflict with the federal charitable choice provisions. This can best be accomplished through a careful review of state laws, regulations, and procedures. Language that directly challenges the federal provisions can be revised or removed and any practices found to discourage the inclusion of FBOs can be changed. After such a review, the state can educate personnel on any changes made and how any new practices should be implemented. A similar process should occur at the local level, especially if the state's welfare program is administered at the county level.

FBOs can also take action to avoid some pitfalls that discourage partnerships between FBOs and government. Many stakeholders support the idea of intermediary organizations. Smaller FBOs can contract or form partnerships with intermediaries that have the expertise, capacity, and capital to apply for and maintain a government grant or contract. These organizations can also provide technical assistance to increase FBOs' capacity. Intermediaries often have a history of interacting with government and are sometimes established expressly to meet the regulations and requirements of government grants or contracts.

Another option is for smaller FBOs to join or form a coalition. Many counties in California have encouraged congregations to participate in coalition organizations that can share the costs, staff, and facilities necessary to maintain countywide welfare-to-work contracts (California Council of Churches, 2001). Another strategy for FBOs, especially congregations, is to incorporate a separate nonprofit organization that operates primarily to provide the government-funded services. The structure of a separately incorporated 501(c)(3) organization is often more conducive to meeting state or local requirements.

How are states and localities held accountable for ensuring there are secular alternatives to FBO-provided services?

Section 104 of PRWORA requires that, if a client or potential client objects to the "religious character" of a faith-based provider, then the government is obligated to arrange for a timely, accessible, and equivalent service from another provider. State and local officials, not the providers of service, must meet this obligation. Because most states and localities contract with many secular organizations, it should not be difficult for them to provide alternatives to FBO-provided services. However, there is very little research or documentation showing that governments have implemented or planned for the provision related to secular alternatives.

According to Stanley Carlson-Thies, now of the Center for Public Justice and formerly of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, the law requires an available alternative, *if* needed. States and localities are not required to have established alternative service providers unless the need for alternatives is first brought to their attention. Carlson-Thies suggested that states and localities would benefit from starting the planning process before the need arises, or could at least plan for diversity in sub-contractors within a given state or locality. For more information, call Stanley Carlson-Thies at 410/571-6300.

How do states hold FBOs accountable for restricting the use of government funds to approved services and for protecting clients' religious freedoms?

Under the charitable choice provisions of PRWORA, FBOs are held to the same fiscal accountability standards as other service providers. They must follow their state or locality's reporting requirements and can be subject to federal audits. FBOs may be required (if using CSBG monies) or encouraged (if using TANF monies) to segregate the government funds from their general funds. If an FBO maintains a separate account for government funds, then any fiscal audit of the organization is limited to that account. The segregation of these funds also makes it easier for the FBO to demonstrate it is using the funds for only those purposes allowed under charitable choice. Many diverse national religious organizations advocate for the creation of a separate 501(c)(3) organization to provide services under a government grant or contract in order to further segregate government funds (Breger et al., May 2001; and California Council of Churches, 2001). Maintaining a separate organization also decreases the likelihood that all the FBO's funds will be audited.

The charitable choice provisions maintain that none of the government funds FBOs receive to provide services may be "expended for sectarian worship, instruction, or proselytization." Consequently, FBOs are also held responsible for protecting their clients' religious freedoms. They may not discriminate against clients for their religious beliefs and may not require clients to participate in religious activities in order to receive services. Some states are taking steps to ensure that government officials are well aware of the requirement to protect clients' religious freedoms. For example, Virginia appointed a state faith-based liaison to educate community faith-based liaisons about this responsibility. For more information on the Virginia Faith-Based and Community Initiative, call 800/777-8293.

Yet, for the most part, there is little evidence of enforcement of this provision. A 2002 study identified limited oversight of the religious practices of government-funded programs. Only three of 54 FBOs receiving government funding were asked by the government to reduce their religious emphasis or practices (Monsma and Mounts, 2002). However, this data does not reveal what means were used to determine whether the FBOs were improperly using government funds for worship, instruction, or proselytization *or* whether those asked to curtail their religious practices were actually violating the charitable choice provisions.

Some service recipients have sued a state or locality, asserting their religious freedoms have not been protected. The state, as the contractor of the services, is held responsible for protecting a client's religious freedoms. In Washington County, Texas, the Texas Civil Rights Project and the American Jewish Congress filed a lawsuit against the Texas Department of Human Services for its funding of Jobs Partnership. The faith-based job-training program spent state funds on Bibles and incorporated religious activities and beliefs into almost all services, as shown in both its budget and curriculum. The only secular job-training program in the area was located in the next county, making it an inaccessible option for many clients. After being dismissed by a lower court in February 2001, a federal appeals court agreed to reinstate a portion of a Texas case in May 2002 to determine the plaintiff's claims for monetary damages. For more information on this case, see http://www.ajcongress.org/pages/RELS2002/MAY_2002/may02_07.htm

Research Findings

There have been several recently published studies or surveys of government-funded FBO-provided services. The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) recently conducted a review of existing research on the implementation of charitable choice and found that at least 19 states have contracted with FBOs to provide some welfare-related services. The report concludes that a growing number of

states have contracted with FBOs using TANF and WtW funds, though it cautions that no national picture can be drawn of the extent to which states have responded to charitable choice (GAO, 2002). In a national survey conducted last year, GAO (2001) found that contracts with FBOs account for eight percent of TANF funds spent by state governments on contracts with nongovernmental entities nationally. Amy Sherman looked at government contracting with FBOs in nine states in 2000 and in 15 states, including the original nine, in 2002. Government contracting with FBOs in eight of the nine originally surveyed states had increased substantially, from over $7.5 million to over $88 million. In 2002, Sherman found 726 examples of government contracting with FBOs in the 15 states, totaling almost $124 million.

Although there is evidence that financial collaboration between FBOs and government is increasing, the findings are mixed about how well stakeholders understand the charitable choice provisions of PRWORA. Sherman's 2002 study found that more than half of the FBOs able to be categorized were determined to be "new" players, meaning they had no previous history of government contracting. This finding suggests that charitable choice could be contributing to an increase in financial collaboration. However, other studies indicate that knowledge and implementation of charitable choice is still lacking. In a California study, only 4.7 percent of religious leaders and 7.8 percent of leaders of faith-based nonprofit organizations said they were "very familiar" with charitable choice. For these same subgroups, 28.5 percent and 39.1 percent, respectively, said they were "somewhat familiar" with the provisions (California Council of Churches, 2001).

Although a more accurate picture of the scope of collaboration between FBOs and government is emerging, assessments of the *efficacy* of faith-based initiatives are still few in number. In its review of more than 30 reports and publications, GAO (2002) found no information on which to assess the effectiveness of FBOs as providers of social services. A recent review of the research by the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Research on Religions and Urban Civil Society found that only 25 studies, 24 of which were published in the past eight years, examined the effectiveness of faith-based initiatives. Among those 25 studies, none used a nationally representative sample or a true experimental design with random assignment. Although the "quality of intentional studies reviewed, on the whole, is not particularly strong," the author does conclude that his review of the research "documents important preliminary evidence that participation in various social service and health related interventions administered by faith-based groups and individuals tend to be associated with improved outcomes" (Johnson, 2002).

The Measures Survey, performed in 1997, indicated that 66 percent of congregations routinely collected or reported data on units or service provided and 53 percent tracked their costs. However, the survey revealed that even though most congregations were collecting some data, they did so less frequently than other types of nonprofit organizations. In addition, congregations performed program evaluations less frequently than they collected data. The surveyed congregations cited two reasons for the lack of program evaluation: their program results are often intangible and their stakeholders were less likely to ask them to measure accomplishments. The congregations also acknowledged that many of them lacked the knowledge needed to measure accomplishments and had a limited capacity to collect and manage data (Independent Sector, 1998). This survey was not specific to congregations providing services with government funds, but it likely demonstrates the general trend in congregations' assessment of the services they provide.

The current body of research on the effectiveness of services provided by FBOs may be inconclusive, but additional research on the effectiveness of services provided by FBOs *and* CBOs is planned or underway. For example, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has announced several research initiatives on services provided by FBOs and CBOs in the past few months. For more information on HHS requests for grant applications, see http://www.hhs.gov/faith/funding.html.

In addition, the Rockefeller Institute on Government, with support from the Pew Charitable Trusts, has developed the Roundtable on Religion and Social Welfare Policy. The Roundtable conducts in-depth nationwide research on the role and efficacy of faith-based social service programs to address gaps in knowledge and promote a more informed public debate on faith-based social service initiatives. For more information on the Roundtable, visit http://www.religionandsocialpolicy.org.

Innovative Practices

Ohio

The Summit County Department of Job and Family Services in Ohio wanted to extend the scope and impact of its social service offerings. The department recognized the need to form relationships with some traditional and nontraditional partners, including FBOs, to better meet the social safety net needs of certain community members. Yet the department encountered some challenges in developing this initiative. For example, it initially issued a very broad RFP to the entire faith community without first establishing relationships within the community. The department received few applications, and many of those it did receive demonstrated the FBOs' lack of resources and capacity to meet the RFP's requirements.

The department started over using meetings and forums to develop relationships with members of the faith community and to educate FBOs on the funding process. It also held technical assistance sessions on how to establish a separate 501(c)(3) organization, budget allocation and reporting, and evaluation methods. In addition, the department developed a "clearinghouse" under which a third party serves as the administrative agent for several smaller FBOs.

This approach has succeeded. The department is now engaged in capacity building and sustainability planning. It is moving toward measuring the impacts of services provided by FBOs using government funds. Project A.G.A.P.E., which is partially funded by the department, provides tutoring, counseling, and family workshops to low-income clients. The project also consults with other nonprofit organizations on how to build an infrastructure to partner with government and with the department to help assess community needs. Contact: Daisy Alford-Smith, director, Summit County Department of Job and Family Services, 330/643-8200 or smithd19@odjfs.state.oh.us.

New York

Under its Faith-Based Employment Encouragement Demonstration Project, New York City contracts with FBOs to contact and work with sanctioned welfare recipients. The initiative enables FBOs to provide outreach and counseling services to individuals who have traditionally failed to meet the welfare program's work participation requirements. Project funding comes from federal TANF funds for the state and is issued through the Research Foundation of the State University of New York.

Judah International, in Brooklyn, New York, was a subcontractor in the pilot phase of the project. Last November, Judah International responded to an RFP for the continuation of the project and was designated a lead agency. The FBO provides services such as locating welfare clients who have been sanctioned, performing a total assessment of the clients, determining what support services the clients need, and providing job referrals, job training, and job placement. The church also works closely with other partners in the community (e.g., the Brooklyn Pediatric AIDS Network and the Brooklyn Prenatal Care Consortium) to provide free medical and mental health services to clients. In addition, it is involved with food pantries, mentoring groups, and other organizations that provide support services.

Judah International also serves as an intermediary organization under the demonstration project. It provides technical assistance and support to a coalition of churches and congregations and provides

financial oversight and management assistance to smaller FBOs. Judah International is working under a performance-based contract. It has brought in certified public accountants and bookkeepers to help meet its reporting requirements, since its performance-based contract requires more reporting and recordkeeping than its previous cost-based contract during the pilot phase of the project. The funds the FBO receives from the project are used to reengage its clients to the welfare system. Direct services are provided with its own funds. Contact: Reverend Dr. Cheryl Anthony, executive director, Judah International, 718/771-0020 or judahinternational@msn.com.

Michigan

Love for Children, a faith-based nonprofit organization in Manistee, Michigan, was funded by the Kellogg Foundation as a pilot program to fill the gaps in services for low-income families in Manistee County. As the director of the program, Karen Bruchan's first task was to visit local social service agencies, identify what community needs were not being met through their services, and then approach local congregations to identify how they could help meet those needs. The Michigan Family Independence Agency (MFIA) was an active partner in this process. MFIA has a long history of working with FBOs to meet the community's needs and has been associated with Love for Children for almost ten years.

In 2000 the Michigan Human Services Collaborating Body issued an RFP for Strong Families/Safe Children funds to be issued through MFIA. Strong Families/Safe Children is Michigan's community-based and statewide collaborative initiative for the federal Promoting Safe and Stable Families legislation, which aims to prevent out-of-home placements. Love for Children applied for and received an $11,225 contract for its weekly life skills program.

The weekly life skills program begins with a volunteer-prepared dinner at the Manistee County Family Life Center for families followed by a choice of classes for the parents and activities for the children (from nursery school through high school). Parents have the option of attending parenting classes or life skill classes on topics such as infant brain development, drugs and pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and marriage and the family. During this time, the facility is open to other CBOs to present their services, such as nutrition or individual development account (IDA) programs. After the classes, each adult receives one bag of groceries and is invited to shop at the in-kind gift store that is supplied with manufacturers' overruns.

The Strong Families/Safe Children grant covers the costs of the dinners, the life skills classes, the groceries, and the store. Volunteers run almost all of the services. The CASMAN Alternative School, a long-time partner of Love for Children, runs the other components of the program, such as the classes for parents and activities for children. It also handles publicity and overall organization. From October 2001 to April 2002, Love for Children served more than 1,300 meals. Attendance of the life skills classes ranged between 11 and 15 adults per week. In October 2003, the FBO will begin their third grant cycle with a grant of $18,600. Contacts: Karen Bruchan, director, Love for Children, 231/723-7269; or Michigan Family Independence Agency, 231/723-8375.

For more examples of innovative practices of collaboration between FBOs and government, see Amy L. Sherman, *Collaborations Catalogue: A Report on Charitable Choice Implementation in 15 States* (Washington, D.C.: Hudson Institute, 2002), at http://www.hudsonfaithincommunities.org. Dr. Sherman will also be releasing the results of a survey of FBOs contracting with government under charitable choice in September 2002, which will be available at the same address.

Resource Contacts

American Jewish Congress, Marc Stern, 212/360-1545; or http://www.ajcongress.org.

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 202/544-4226; or http://www.bjcpa.org.

Center for Public Justice, Stephen Lazarus, 410/571-6300; or http://www.cpjustice.org.

Congress of National Black Churches, James Ferguson, 202/296-5657; or http://www.cnbc.org.

Hudson Institute, Faith in Communities, Amy L. Sherman, 434/293-5656 or shermana@cstone.net; or http://www.hudsonfaithincommunities.org.

Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, Melissa Rogers, 202/955-5075 or mrogers@pewforum.org; or http://www.pewforum.org.

U.S. Department of Education, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Elizabeth Farrell, 202/401-0003; or http://www.hhs.gov/faith.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Cathy Deeds, 202/401-3161 or Cathy.Deeds@hhs.gov; or http://www.hhs.gov/faith.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Cheryl Appline, 202/708-2404; or http://www.hud.gov/offices/fbci/index.cfm.

U.S. Department of Justice, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Scott Bloch, 202/514-6702.

U.S. Department of Labor, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, Erica Sager, 202/693-6450; or http://www.dol.gov/cfbci.

White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, 202/456-7019; or http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/faith-based.

Publications

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs and Interfaith Alliance Foundation. *Keeping the Faith: The Promise of Cooperation, The Perils of Government Funding—A Guide for Houses of Worship.* Washington, D.C.: Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs and Interfaith Alliance Foundation, 2001. Available at http://www.interfaithalliance.org/Initiatives/ktf.pdf.

Breger, Marshall, et al. *In Good Faith: A Dialogue on Government Funding of Faith-Based Social Services.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University, Feinstein Center for American Jewish History, May 2001. Available at http://www.temple.edu/feinsteinctr/Report.pdf.

California Council of Churches. *Can We Make Welfare Reform Work?—California Religious Community Capacity Study.* Sacramento, Calif.: California Council of Churches, 2001. Available at http://www.calchurches.org/WelfareReport.html.

Carlson-Thies, Stanley. *Charitable Choice for Welfare and Community Services: An Implementation Guide for State, Local, and Federal Officials.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Public Justice, December 2000. Available at http://downloads.weblogger.com/gems/cpj/CCImplementationGuide.pdf.

Center for Public Justice. *Charitable Choice Compliance: A National Report Card.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Public Justice, 2000. Available at http://downloads.weblogger.com/gems/cpj/296.pdf.

Hangley Jr., Bill, and Wendy S. McClanahan. *Mustering the Armies of Compassion: An Analysis of One Year of Literacy Programming in Faith-Based Institutions.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Public/Private Ventures, February 2002. Available at http://www.ppv.org/pdffiles/mustering.pdf.

Independent Sector. *America's Religious Congregations: Measuring Their Contributions to Society.* Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector, November 2000. Available at http://www.independentsector.org/programs/research/ReligiousCong.pdf.

Johnson, Byron R. *Objective Hope: Assessing the Effectiveness of Faith-Based Organizations—A Review of the Literature.* Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania, Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, 2002. Available at http://www.manhattan-institute.org/crrucs_objective_hope.pdf.

Kramer, Fredrica D., Demetra Smith Nightingale, John Trutko, Shayne Spaulding, and Burt S. Barnow. *Faith-Based Organizations Providing Employment and Training Services: A Preliminary Exploration.* Rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, February 2002. Available at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410436.pdf.

Loconte, Joseph, and William W. Beach. *The Senate's Response to the President's Faith-Based Agenda: An Analysis of the CARE Act.* Washington, D.C.: Heritage Foundation, May 23, 2002. Available at http://www.heritage.org/library/backgrounder/pdf/bg1555.pdf.

Monsma, Stephen V., and Carolyn M. Mounts. *Working Faith: How Religious Organizations Provide Welfare-to-Work Services.* Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania, Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, 2002. Available at http://www.manhattan-institute.org/working_faith.pdf.

Sherman, Amy L. *The Charitable Choice Handbook for Ministry Leaders.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Public Justice, 2001. Available at http://downloads.weblogger.com/gems/cpj/CCHandbook.pdf.

Sherman, Amy L. *Collaborations Catalogue: A Report on Charitable Choice Implementation in 15 States.* Washington, D.C.: Hudson Institute, 2002. Executive Summary available at http://hudsonfaithincommunities.org/articles/FinalExecSummBroch.pdf. To order complete report, call 434/293-5656.

Sherman, Amy L. *The Growing Impact of Charitable Choice: A Catalogue of New Collaborations between Government and Faith-Based Organizations in Nine States.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Public Justice, 2000. Executive Summary available at http://www.cpjustice.org/stories/storyreader$315. To order complete report, call 866/275-8784.

Tenpas, Kathryn Dunn. *Can an Office Change a Country? The White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, A Year in Review.* Washington, D.C.: Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, February 2002. Available at http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/rel_pew_forum_office.pdf.

United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society. *Community Ministries and Government Funding: A Response to Questions United Methodists Are Asking about Faith-based*

Initiatives. Washington, D.C.: United Methodist Church, 2001. Available at http://www.umc-gbcs.org/faith.pdf.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. "The Compassion Capital Fund and the Faith- and Community-Based Initiative." *HHS Fact Sheet.* Washington, D.C., June 5, 2002. Available at http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2002pres/20020605.html.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Charitable Choice: Overview of Research Findings on Implementation.* Washington, D.C., January 2002. Available at http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02337.pdf.

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Welfare Reform: Interim Report on Potential Ways to Strengthen Federal Oversight of State and Local Contracting.* Washington, D.C., April 2002. Available at http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02245.pdf.

White House. *Rallying the Armies of Compassion.* Washington, D.C., January 2001. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/reports/faithbased.pdf.

White House. *Unlevel Playing Field: Barriers to Participation by Faith-Based and Community Organizations in Federal Social Service Programs.* Washington, D.C., August 2001. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/08/20010816-3-report.pdf.

Working Group on Human Needs and Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. *Finding Common Ground: 29 Recommendations.* Washington, D.C.: Working Group on Human Needs and Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, January 2002. Available at http://www.working-group.org/report.pdf.

The Welfare Information Network is supported by grants form the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK

1401 New York Avenue, NW-Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").